



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/767,503	01/28/2004	Abhijit Kundu	MSFT-2856/304813.01	5506
41505	7590	06/15/2006		
WOODCOCK WASHBURN LLP (MICROSOFT CORPORATION) ONE LIBERTY PLACE - 46TH FLOOR PHILADELPHIA, PA 19103				EXAMINER FABER, DAVID
			ART UNIT 2178	PAPER NUMBER

DATE MAILED: 06/15/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office communication concerning this application

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/767,503	KUNDU, ABHIJIT
	Examiner David Faber	Art Unit 2178

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED' (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 May 2006.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 28-43 and 46-50 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 28-43 and 46-50 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 28 January 2004 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|--|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____. |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>1/28/2004</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____. |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This office action is response to Applicant's decision on the requirement for restriction/election.

This office action is made Non-Final.

2. Claims 28-43, and 46-50 are pending. Claims 1-27, and 44-45 have been cancelled by the Applicant in response of electing Group III from the restriction.
3. Claims 28, 34, 38, 46, and 47 are independent claims.

Election/Restrictions

4. Applicant elects the claims of Group III, Claims 23-43, and 46-50, with traverse for examination.

Information Disclosure Statement

5. The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on 28 January 2004 is in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the information disclosure statement is being considered by the examiner.

Drawings

6. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they include the following reference character(s) not mentioned in the description: 150. Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d), or amendment to the specification to add the reference character(s) in the description in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(b) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid

Art Unit: 2178

abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

7. The drawings are objected to because in Figure 4, there are two reference numbers 120 for the processing unit when only one reference number is needed. Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the

applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

7. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

8. Claims 30, 34-35, 38, 40-41, and 47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

9. Claim 30 recites the limitation "the people" in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

10. Claim 30 recites the limitation "the download log" in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

11. Claims 34 and 40 recite the limitation "the clickthrough data regarding the tracked webpage" in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

12. Claims 35 and 41 recite the limitation "the time zone of the geographical area" in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

13. Claim 38 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, since the limitation "loading the target URL into a dynamic hyper text markup language (DHTML) object viewer" fails to relate or coincide with the other limitations with the limitations. In other words, once the target URL is loaded into the DHTML object viewer, what does the DHTML object viewer do? What happens to the target URL? Since the claim limitation

fail to shows these missing functionalities, the Examiner views the claim as vague and indefinite.

14. Claim 47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, for using the term "substantially real time" for being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Therefore, Examiner views the term being at the real time.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

15. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

16. Claim 32 and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Jensen et al (US PGPub 2004/0243536, filed 5/28/2003).

As per independent claim 32, Jensen et al discloses a method comprising:

- maintaining a list of one or more tracked webpages; (FIG 16, indicator 1660 Paragraph 0091)
- computing one or more target directories into which a tracked webpage from the list of one or more tracked webpages can be downloaded; (FIG 16,

indicator 1620; FIG 19, indicator 1920; Paragraph 0088, 0091: a folder selection menu to specify a folder in which to save the specified web page)

- scheduling the periodic download of the tracked webpage into the one or more target directories; (FIG 16, FIG 19, indicator 1925; Paragraph 0088, 0091: user can set the time intervals between each download)
- launching a downloader capable of downloading the tracked webpage into the one or more target directories; (FIG 19, indicators 1935-1945; Paragraphs 0089-0090)

As per dependent claim 36, Jensen et al discloses wherein the periodic download of the tracked webpage is scheduled such that the one or more target directories are substantially likely to contain a copy of the tracked webpage that reflects any recent changes to the webpage. (FIG 16-19: Since a user can set up the scheduler to have the specified web page to any time frequency, e.g. hourly, to be downloaded to the specified folder, it is inherent if the web page was updated between the hourly downloads, then the user would be downloading the updated web page during the next scheduled download.)

17. Claim 47-50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Allen et al (US PGPub 2004/0059997, filed 9/12/2002).

As per independent claim 47, Allen et al discloses a method comprising:

- tracking the number clicks on a link of a webpage (Paragraph 0016, lines 11-13; Paragraph 0023-25, 0331)
- providing the number of clicks for display in substantially real time. (Paragraph 0026-0027, 0032: User access web page which requests click information, and is transmitted and displayed to the user using a DHTML program in real time after receiving)

As per dependent claim 48, Allen et al discloses providing the webpage for display. (Paragraph 0022, Paragraph 0026-0027)

As per dependent claim 49, Allen et al discloses highlighting the link on the webpage (Paragraph 0016, lines 6-7: links may be highlighted words)

As per dependent claim 50, Allen et al discloses providing the number of clicks is done via the Internet. (Paragraph 0020; 0023-0025)

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

18. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

19. Claim 28-30, 33-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jensen et al (US PGPub 2004/0243536, filed 5/28/2003) in further in view of Allen et al (US PGPub 2004/0059997, filed 9/12/2002).

As per independent claim 28, Jensen et al discloses a method comprising:

- Computing a target directory for a tracked webpage (FIG 16, indicator 1620; FIG 19, indicator 1920; Paragraph 0088, 0091: a folder selection menu to specify a folder in which to save the specified web page)
- Scheduling periodic downloads of the tracked webpage into the target directory (FIG 16, FIG 19, indicator 1925; Paragraph 0088, 0091: user can set the time intervals between each download)
- Downloading the tracking webpage into the target directory (FIG 19, indicators 1935-1945; Paragraphs 0089-0090)

However, Jensen et al fails to specifically disclose accessing clickthrough data associated with links of the tracked webpage; and combining the tracked webpage as stored in the target directory and the clickthrough data associated with the links of the tracked webpage into a final report capable of being displayed, wherein the final report simultaneously displays the tracked webpage and the clickthrough data.

However, Allen et al discloses the ability to access and store clickthrough data (Paragraph 0026-0027), and combines a webpage and clickthrough data to create a new page or report that displays the webpage along with the clickthrough data being displayed on it (Paragraph 0027,0032-0033; FIG 3)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to have modified Jensen et al's scheduler and downloader utility with Allen et al's ability to access clickthrough data since it would have provided

displaying statistical information regarding the use of a web page on a display screen of a user computer.

As per dependent claim 29, Jensen et al fails to specifically disclose an interactive display that highlights corresponding features of the tracked webpage and the clickthrough data upon indication of a feature of a tracked webpage or the clickthrough data. However, Allen et al discloses when a user moves the mouse over the link, the URL of the hovered link is displayed along with the number of times the link has been accessed thus highlighting or being shown for attention the number of times the link has been accessed along with the URL. (Paragraph 0027, 0033) In addition, Paragraph 0016, lines 6-7: links may be highlighted words.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to have modified Jensen et al's scheduler and downloader utility with Allen et al's display feature of displaying clickthrough data since it would have provided displaying statistical information to quickly visualize traffic patterns on the web page while maintaining its overall appearance.

As per dependent claim 30, Jensen et al fails to specifically disclose the final report displays corresponding demographic data about the people who clicked on a link on the tracked webpage when a feature of either the tracked webpage or the clickthrough data is indicated. However, Allen et al discloses the ability to track personal information on each user such as age, gender, or race. (Paragraph 0018)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to have modified Jensen et al's scheduler and downloader utility

and Allen et al's display feature of displaying clickthrough data with Allen et al's ability to obtain demographic data since it would have provided the ability to track detailed statistics information relative to user demographics who responded to clicking a link.

As per dependent claims 33 and 34, Claims 33 and 34 recite similar limitations as in Claim 32 and is similarly rejected under rationale. Jensen et al fails to specifically disclose storing clickthrough data regarding a tracked webpage, and retrieving the tracked webpage and the clickthrough data regarding the tracked webpage, wherein the retrieved tracked webpage and the clickthrough data regarding the tracked webpage are combined into a final report capable of displaying the tracked webpage and the clickthrough data regarding the tracked webpage simultaneously. However, Allen et al discloses the ability to store clickthrough data (Paragraph 0026-0027), and retrieves a webpage (Paragraph 0022-0023) and clickthrough data to create a new page or report that displays the webpage along with the clickthrough data being displayed on it.

(Paragraph 0027,0033; FIG 3)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to have modified Jensen et al's scheduler and downloader utility with Allen et al's ability to calculate clickthrough data since it would have provided displaying statistical information regarding the use of a web page on a display screen of a user computer.

As per independent claim 46, Claim 46 recites similar limitations as in Claim 28, and is rejected under similar rationale.

20. Claim 31 and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jensen et al (US PGPub 2004/0243536, filed 5/28/2003) in further in view of Allen et al (US PGPub 2004/0059997, filed 9/12/2002) in further view of Web Server "Visitor Tracking" Log Analyzer (hereinafter "Web Server") (Web Server "Visitor Tracking" Log Analyzer, last published 2/8/2002)

As per dependent claim 31, Jensen et al fails to specifically disclose storing time zone information for at least one of the clickthrough data and the tracked webpage. However, Allen et al discloses the ability to track and display the time and day of the week. (Paragraph 0018)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to have modified Jensen et al scheduler/downloader with Allen et al's ability to display time the time of day since it would provided the benefit of showing a breakdown of the type and the environment of user selecting each link.

However, Jensen et al and Allen et al fail to disclose storing time zone information for at least one of the clickthrough data and the tracked webpage. However, Web Server discloses information about time zone information being stored in a long when a file was served to a client or a request to the client was served. (Page 1)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to have modified Jensen et al and Allen et al's invention to include Web Server's ability to determine and store time zone of each file served to the client since it would provided information to analyze regarding the narrower area of location of the visitor and the time of access by the visitor accessing the web server.

As per dependent claim 35, claim 35 recites similar limitations as in claim 34 and is similar rejection under rationale. Furthermore, Jensen et al fails to specifically disclose storing time zone information for at least one of the clickthrough data and the tracked webpage. However, Allen et al discloses the ability to track and display the time and day of the week. (Paragraph 0018)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to have modified Jensen et al scheduler/downloader with Allen et al's ability to display time the time of day since it would provided the benefit of showing a breakdown of the type and the environment of user selecting each link.

However, Jensen et al and Allen et al fails to specifically disclose the final report contains clickthrough data that is adjusted to reflect the time zone of the geographical area that the webpage is designed to serve. Web Server discloses information about time zone information being stored in a long when a file was served to a client or a request to the client was served. (Page 1) In addition, it is inherent each time zone represents a different geographical region (Western, Mountain, Central and Eastern), thus the Web Server time zone information of the visitor reflects the time zone of the geographical area.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to have modified Jensen et al and Allen et al's invention to include Web Server's ability to determine and store time zone of each file served to the client since it would provided information to analyze regarding the narrower area of location of the visitor and the time of access by the visitor accessing the web server.

21. Claim 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jensen et al (US PGPub 2004/0243536, filed 5/28/2003) in further in view of Allen et al (US PGPub 2004/0059997, filed 9/12/2002) in further view of Leighton et al (US Patent 6,108,703, patented 8/22/2000)

As per dependent claim 37, Jensen et al fails to specifically disclose the downloader hashes link Uniform Resource Locators when the tracked webpage is located. However, Leighton et al discloses the ability to hash link URL found in the tracked webpage according to a predefined algorithm (Column 6, lines 47-65; Column 7, line 24-29, 49- Column 8, line 12; Col 8, lines 38-50)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to have modified Jensen et al's scheduler and downloader utility and Allen et al's ability to obtain clickthrough data with Leighton et al's ability to hash URLs since it would have provided the benefit of knowing a URL will stay familiar to a system as long as changes are not made to its content.

22. Claims 38-40, and 42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jensen et al (US PGPub 2004/0243536, filed 5/28/2003) in further in view of Allen et al (US PGPub 2004/0059997, filed 9/12/2002) in further view of Leighton et al (US Patent 6,108,703, patented 8/22/2000) in further view of Mantha et al (US Patent #6,173,779, patented 12/19/2000)

Jensen et al discloses using a downloader that obtains a target uniform locator URL for a tracked webpage (FIG 16-17, 19; Paragraph 0087-0092: The downloader using the information from the scheduler to obtain the URL in order to download the web page, thus obtaining the URL) and downloading the tracked webpage into a target directory (FIG 19, indicators 1935-1945; Paragraphs 0089-0090)

However, Jensen et al fails to disclose loading the target URL into a dynamic hyper text mark-up language (DHTML) object viewer and to facilitate access to clickthrough data. On the other hand, Allen et al discloses loading the URL into a DHTML object viewer (Allen et al discloses a DHTML program that extracts the information regarding the number of link access from the URLs from which the page. Since the program scans each link within the page shown in a browser at the URL address of the page, it is being viewed loading the URL into a DHTML viewer) (Paragraph 0027, 0032), and facilitate access to clickthrough data (Paragraph 0026-0027)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to have modified Jensen et al's scheduler and downloader utility with Allen et al's ability to calculate clickthrough data since it would have provided displaying statistical information regarding the use of a web page on a display screen of a user computer.

Furthermore, Jensen et al and Allen et al fails to disclose to hashing one or more link URLs found in the tracked webpage according to a predefined algorithm and generating a list of hashed link URLs. However, Leighton et al discloses the ability to

hash one link URL found in the tracked webpage according to a predefined algorithm and generating a list of one or more hashed link URLs (Column 6, lines 47-65; Column 7, line 24-29, 49- Column 8, line 12; Col 8, lines 38-50: Since the claim limitation states one or more URLs are hashed and a list may only include one link if only one link is hashed, thus a list would only contain one hashed link, then Leighton et al discloses at least one hash link is generated)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to have modified Jensen et al's scheduler and downloader utility and Allen et al's ability to obtain clickthrough data with Leighton et al's ability to hash URLs since it would have provided the benefit of knowing a URL will stay familiar to a system as long as changes are not made to its content.

Finally, Jensen et al, Allen et al, and Leighton et al fail to specifically disclose updating file references in the downloaded tracked webpage to refer to a local path, wherein the local path indicates the target directory where the tracked webpage is stored. Mantha et al discloses the ability to update the links in the saved webpage to refer to a local path where the webpage is saved in the saved directory on the client storage (FIG 11-16; e.g. Col 2, lines 22-44; Col. 13, lines 33-47)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to have modified Jensen et al's scheduler and downloader utility Allen et al's ability to obtain clickthrough data, and with Leighton et al's ability to hash URLs since it would have provided the benefit of storing a web page on the client for client-side browsing of the page content to be retrieved for subsequent viewing or use.

As per dependent claim 39, Jensen et al fails to storing clickthrough data regarding a tracked webpage, wherein the clickthrough data is identified by hashed link URLs that are hashed according to the predefined algorithm used in hashing the one or more link URLs found in the webpage. However, Allen et al discloses the ability to store clickthrough data (Paragraph 0026-0027).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to have modified Jensen et al's scheduler and downloader utility with Allen et al's ability to access clickthrough data since it would have provided displaying statistical information regarding the use of a web page on a display screen of a user computer.

Furthermore, Jensen et al and Allen et al fails to disclose to hashing one or more link URLs found in the tracked webpage according to a predefined algorithm and generating a list of hashed link URLs. However, Leighton et al discloses the ability hash one link URL found in the tracked webpage according to a predefined algorithm and generating a list of one or more hashed link URLs (Column 6, lines 47-65; Column 7, line 24-29, 49- Column 8, line 12; Col 8, lines 38-50: Since the claim limitation state one or more URLs and a list may only include one link if only one link is hashed, thus a list is one hashed link, then Leighton et al discloses at least one hash link is generated)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to have modified Jensen et al's scheduler and downloader utility and Allen et al's ability to storing clickthrough data of link URLs with Leighton et al's ability to hash URLs to have Allen et al's clickthrough data of link URLs to be hashed

link URLs since it would have provided the benefit of knowing a URL will stay familiar to a system as long as changes are not made to its content.

As per dependent claim 40, Claim 40 recites similar limitations as in Claim 28 and is similar rejected under rationale.

As per dependent claim 42, Jensen et al discloses generating a download log that identifies files associated with a tracked webpage (FIG 20-24; Paragraph 0095, 0101, 0108-0109: All the pages associated with the tracked webpage are downloaded and a list or log is provided showing all the pages saved associated with the track webpage)

23. Claim 41 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jensen et al (US PGPub 2004/0243536, filed 5/28/2003) in further view of Allen et al (US PGPub 2004/0059997, filed 9/12/2002) in further view of Leighton et al (US Patent 6,108,703, patented 8/22/2000) in further view of Mantha et al (US Patent #6,173,779, patented 12/19/2000) in further view of Web Server "Visitor Tracking" Log Analyzer (hereinafter "Web Server") (Web Server "Visitor Tracking" Log Analyzer, last published 2/8/2002)

As per dependent claim 41, claim 41 recites similar limitations as in claim 34 and is similar rejection under rationale. Furthermore, Jensen et al fails to specifically disclose storing time zone information for at least one of the clickthrough data and the tracked webpage. However, Allen et al discloses the ability to track and display the time and day of the week. (Paragraph 0018)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to have modified Jensen et al scheduler/downloader with Allen et al's ability to display time the time of day since it would provided the benefit of showing a breakdown of the type and the environment of user selecting each link.

However, Jensen et al, Allen et al, Leighton et al, and Mantha et al fail to specifically disclose the final report contain clickthrough data that is adjusted to reflect the time zone of the geographical area that the webpage is designed to serve. Web Server discloses information about time zone information being stored in a long when a file was served to a client or a request to the client was served. (Page 1) In addition, it is inherent each time zone represents a different geographical region (Western, Mountain, Central and Eastern), thus the Web Server time zone information of the visitor reflects the time zone of the geographical area.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to have modified Jensen et al, Allen et al, Leighton et al, and Mantha et al's abilities to include Web Server's ability to determine and store time zone of each file served to the client since it would provided information to analyze regarding the narrower area of location of the visitor and the time of access by the visitor accessing the web server.

24. Claim 43 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jensen et al (US PGPub 2004/0243536, filed 5/28/2003) in further in view of Allen et al (US PGPub 2004/0059997, filed 9/12/2002) in further view of Leighton et al (US Patent

6,108,703, patented 8/22/2000) in further view of Mantha et al (US Patent #6,173,779, patented 12/19/2000) in further view of Chang et al (US Patent #6,134,584, patented 10/17/2000)

As per dependent Claim 43, Claim 43 recites similar limitations as in Claim 42, and similar rejection under rationale. Furthermore, Jensen et al, Allen et al, Leighton et al, and Mantha et al fail to disclose setting a parameter that defines whether files associated with a tracked webpage will be identified in the download log. However, Chang et al discloses the ability to set a preference whether to download graphical data along with downloading the requested webpage.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to have combined Jensen et al, Allen et al, Leighton et al, and Mantha et al's abilities with Chang et al's ability to set a preference to download graphical data since it would have provided the benefit of downloading web pages based on the custom preferences determined by the user. Thus in conjunction with Jensen et al download log, and the rationale incorporated, using Chang et al's preference not to download graphical data, Jensen's et al download log would not have identified the downloaded webpage's graphical data.

Conclusion

25. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- Braunzell (US PGPub 2004/0068435): Discloses reporting clickthrough rate from an advertisement campaign and contain a web page trafficker for tracking viewers.
- Muret et al (US Patent #6,792,458): Discloses monitoring and analyzing Internet traffic.
- Najork et al (US Patent #6,301,614): Discloses downloading a document, identifying the URLs within the document, and converts the URLs into a fixed size numerical representation.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David Faber whose telephone number is 571-272-2751. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F from 8am to 430pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong, can be reached on 571-272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Application/Control Number: 10/767,503
Art Unit: 2178

Page 21

David Faber
Patient Examiner
AU 2178

A handwritten signature consisting of the letters 'DF' in a stylized, cursive font.A handwritten signature consisting of the letters 'SH' in a stylized, cursive font.

STEPHEN HONG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER